



2fw

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/812,003
Filing Date: March 30, 2004
Applicant: Ja-Hum KU et al.
Group Art Unit: 2812
Examiner: Cheung Lee
Title: NICKEL SALICIDE PROCESS WITH REDUCED DOPANT
DEACTIVATION
Attorney Docket: 2421-000037/US

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Mail Stop **ISSUE FEE**

March 15, 2007

STATEMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b)

Sir:

Further to the telephonic interview conducted January 24, 2007, and the Interview Summary dated February 13, 2007, provided by the Examiner, the following remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

Interview Summary

In accord with the guidance provided in MPEP § 713.04, the Applicants submit the following comments with regard to the substance of the January 24, 2007, interview:

(A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted;

No exhibits or demonstrations were conducted during the interview;

(B) identification of the claims discussed;

No claims were discussed during the interview;

(C) identification of specific prior art discussed;

No prior art was discussed during the interview;

(D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner;

No substantive amendments to the claims or specification were during the interview;

(E) the general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner;

No arguments were presented during the interview;

(F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed;

The Applicants advised the Examiner that the pending Petition to Correct Inventorship had been granted and that the corresponding Declaration was being forwarded from the Petitions Branch to the Art Group.

(G) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview; and

The Examiner was made aware that a corrected Declaration had been filed by the Applications;

(H) in the case of an interview via electronic mail, a paper copy of the Internet e-mail contents MUST be made and placed in the patent application file as required by the Federal Records Act in the same manner as an Examiner Interview Summary Form, PTOL 413, is entered;

The interview was not conducted via email.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that the statements provided above with respect to the interview of January 24, 2007, are in full compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and MPEP § 713.04.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

us
JAC/GPB:ame

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000